International Education Studies; Vol. 5, No. 6; 2012
ISSN 1913-9020 E-ISSN 1913-9039
Published by Canadian Center of Science and Education

Expression – An Experimental Field for Investigation and Management of the Paradox of Education (With Illustrations from Voice Education)

Alena Nohavová[1] & Jan Slavík[2]

[1] Faculty of Education, University of South Bohemia, Czech Republic

[2] Faculty of Education, Charles University in Prague, Czech Republic

Correspondence: Alena Nohavová, Faculty of Education, University of South Bohemia, Jeronýmova 10, 37115 České Budějovice, Czech Republic. Tel: 420-387-773-368. E-mail: nohavova.alena@centrum.cz

Received: July 14, 2012 Accepted: July 30, 2012 Online Published: August 23, 2012

doi:10.5539/ies.v5n6p24 URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ies.v5n6p24

Abstract

This article introduces and explains the concept of the "paradox of education" for capturing the polarity between autonomy and heteronomy in education. The paradox of education is an essential part of the curriculum and, if not under control, manifests itself in the discrepancy between the teaching process, its objectives and evaluation of its outputs. Especially sensitive to the paradox of education are all disciplines that emphasise students' creative expression. In the text expression and its cultural context – expressivity – are characterised as an experimental field for the investigation and management of the tension between autonomy and heteronomy in education. The characteristics of expression are derived from Goodman's (1976) concept of symbolisation as a type of expression, but is developed with regard to the relationship between subject and cultural context and in relation to Searle's (2004) differentiation of first and third person ontology. The interpretation leads to the formulation of a theoretical model of subjectivity in the context of culture in education. The theoretical model of subjectivity shall contribute to the development of a comprehensive approach to the curriculum, which with respect to the paradox of education balances the autonomy of the pupil together with a heteronomous system of cultural rules. The model is illustrated in a case study of voice education. The interpretation supports the educational efforts that lead to a holistic approach to assessment in the expressive disciplines with emphasis on the quality of the educational process, not only on the evaluation of outcomes.

Keywords: paradox of education, expression, expressivity, reflection, voice education

1. Expression as a Research Field for the Paradox of Education

A traditional part of general school education is artistic (aesthetic) disciplines. In line with many other authors Boughton (2004, p. 585) emphasised: "the student experience in a school art program develops the capacity for independent thought and the ability to express ideas" by means of specific expressive forms. The Recommendation of the European Parliament (2006, p. 18) for the area of cultural awareness and expression is worded in the same spirit: "Cultural expression is essential to the development of creative skills, which can be transferred to a variety of professional contexts." This approach is strategically directed to the student's creative autonomy. In practice, however, it gets into opposition with the standardisation and homogenisation of educational outputs, most notably during broad-based student performance evaluations through national or international tests (cf. Boughton, 2004).

The inconsistency has been a subject of reflection and debate at least since the days of J. Dewey and the reform movement in pedagogy in the early 20th century. It concerns a comprehensive concept of the curriculum and values in education, because it combines two contradictory vital aspects of the educational process: towards autonomy, individualisation and innovation on the one hand and the necessity of cultural transmission based on a heteronomous system of rules, norms and scripts on the other. The role of the school is to integrate these two poles. School practice is faced with the paradoxical task of "connecting the irreconcilable." This inconsistency, in principle relevant to all education, we describe here using the term the *paradox of education*.

The reflections of Boughton (2004) and other authors (Boughton, Eisner, & Ligtvoet, 1996; Dorn, Madeja, & Sabol, 2001) on the topic, which we summarise under the name of the paradox of education, are developed

mainly in connection with creative activities in education and the subject needs to be generalised theoretically. Our study aims to contribute to the discussion in this direction. We assume that the paradox of education can best be explored and understood through this focal point: in the tension between the creative personality of the student's grasp of their own ideas and the need to express content in a communicative, intersubjective and comprehensible form.

These are issues which are summarised under Croce's traditional term *expression* in the concept modernised by Goodman (1976) and Kemp (2009). We want to build on the tradition of Goodman's philosophical approach to the Zero educational project and based on "a sense of the unity of a course of thought that ranges over fields from science policy to dance criticism, from literary theory to cognitive psychology, from language to the functions of museums, and from education to the making of worlds" (Goodman, 1984, Preface). In the spirit of this concept, which ensures the empirical validation of the theory, we here illustrate theoretical ideas through knowledge from case study in vocal expression.

1.1 The Paradox of Education in a Social Context

The tension between the liberal demand for *autonomous personal decision-making* of individuals and the dependence of each subject on a *heteronomous social system* of rules, norms, obligations, offers, opportunities and constraints are among the outstanding problems of contemporary Euro-American civilisation (cf. Lipovetsky, 1992; Bourriaud, 2002). They are two sides of the same coin, which we encounter in the field of education under the names individualisation vs. socialisation, autonomy vs. heteronomy, personalisation vs. enculturation, innovation vs. reproduction, etc. In principle these are mutually complementing and competing counterparts, which stand at the foundation of human culture. Throughout history they each balance out and one or the other in time comes to the forefront of social consciousness.

In the last few decades individualism has been emphasised and G. Lipovetsky (1992) did not hesitate to characterise this period by the epithet the "individualistic revolution". This corresponds to the ethos of the educational discourse, which often emphasises the autonomy and authenticity of personal expression, a unique entity (Craft, 1997; Arthur & Davison, 2002).

The programmatic emphasis on individualisation in school leads to enhancement of the paradox of education. Indeed, individualism comes into conflict with schools' role of ensuring epistemic conformity in society, i.e. the transmission of cultural content (cf. Kaščák, 2002, p. 407). This task follows from the educational requirement to "teach something" (not "nothing" or "anything"), i.e. the right to *educational content*. Educational content cannot be confined to individuality. It transcends the limits of the individual, because it results from rules and meanings passed down through the ages, on which culture and the fields of education within it are built.

1.2 Expression and the Paradox of Education

All fields of education must address the paradox of education. The natural laboratories for such study are especially those that deal with expression. They are usually associated with artistic disciplines – visual arts, drama, music, film and dance education. Of course expressive activity is not limited only to the arts. Principles of expression are applied in everyday speech and behaviour, politics, advertising, clothing, cosmetics, housing and many other activities with a symbolic function.

Expression is a particular mode of production and procurement of content and application of influence among people. The theory of expression was developed in the 19th and 20th centuries by Italian aesthetics and art theorist B. Croce (Croce, 1966, p. 219, etc.). Since that time the concept of expression has developed considerably. In this work we rely in particular on Goodman's approach (cf. Goodman, 1976). For education, it is important that Croce and Goodman, and other authors, understand expression as one way of acquiring knowledge.

For Croce expression was a peculiar type of intuitive knowledge based on direct sensory contact with an object. Croce distinguishes this method of cognition from logical conceptual cognition. Both types of knowledge cannot be separated, but neither are they completely interchangeable, because they belong to different ontological and noetic levels (Croce, 1997, p. 1, 28, etc.). Kemp (2009), a contemporary interpreter of Croce's theory, aptly pointed out some of its analogies with B. Russell's concept of learning. Russell (1910-1911), like Croce, distinguished between two types of knowledge acquisition: *knowledge by acquaintance* and *knowledge by description*.

Knowledge by acquaintance requires the presence of the object of which there is knowledge. The same applies to expression. Expression also requires the perceptual presence of the known object. In other words, meaningful knowledge about the expressive object cannot be obtained through its description. Otherwise it would be

possible, for example, to replace listening to Beethoven's 9th Symphony by reading a paper about it or a chart of the music's sound waves.

On the other hand, expression, like description, is an instrument for the mediation of knowledge. This follows from the fact that expression is a kind of symbolisation, i.e. that the object is an expressive tool for the expression of creative intent and a bearer of content. With regard to direct and indirect knowledge expression has an "ambivalent" nature: expression, in contrast to description, simulates the experience of immediate knowledge, but also in conformity with description, expression is a medium for conveying knowledge.

This special nature of expression can be further clarified on the basis of Searle's distinction between two types of ontologies: first-person ontology vs. third person ontology (cf. Searle, 2004, pp. 67-68, 83-84). First-person ontology refers to immediate subjective experience: sensory impressions, emotions and experiences. It thus emphasises the autonomy of the body when grasping and creating content. Third-person ontology, on the other hand, is based on heteronomy and aims at the most objective description up to the level of quantification and logical formalisation. The prerequisite of this are impersonal systems of expression and communication that suppress the personality to allow the sharing of intersubjective meanings of public language (Searle, 2004, p. 189 n.).

The paradox of education and its special role in expression grows out of the difference between first- and third-person ontologies. Expression has a first-person ontology and cannot be reduced to description. In order to respect its cognitive specificity, one cannot learn *about it*, but he/she has to *experience it* by means of one's own creativity and perception. On the other hand, what the subject experiences and can express is content whose creation and interpretation is culturally conditioned and depends on the contexts understood by other people. It is therefore necessary to learn expression and it makes sense to teach it as one of the cultural ways of knowing. Education in expression is therefore particularly sensitive to mastery of the paradox of education. It is extremely important to find a suitable balance between individual creative activity and the necessary degree of learning about contexts of expressive creation. Therefore expression provides a good opportunity for exploration and a deeper understanding of the pedagogical problems associated with the paradox of education.

1.3 Expressivity – the Context for Interpreting Expression

Expressivity is a general psycho-socio-cultural phenomenon or factor which creates a context for the interpretation of expression. In the interpretative context of expressivity various phenomena and manifestations are treated in a special way and require a specific interpretation as metaphors of human existence, as images of the human being, as the sum of how the human perspective is reflected on things (see Ricoeur, 1967, p. 119). Thus "a thing" becomes "an expressive work" that can be interpreted (e.g., a sound becomes music, movement becomes a dance or a dramatic gesture).

So the word *expressivity* is intended as an *explanatory framework*, without which it is not possible to interpret expression. U. Eco (1994) proposes distinguishing more precisely between different levels of the explanatory framework using three concepts: *circumstance, context, co-text*. By drawing a distinction between these concepts it is easier to understand the transitions between first-person and third-person ontology in educational situations. It is therefore useful for an overview of the consequences of the paradox of education.

Circumstance is, according to Eco, an external situation in which expression can occur with its possible context. This means that circumstance is the sum of all possible factors which determine the interpretation of the expression at the time of its exposition. Circumstance contains within itself context and co-text.

Context is the environment in which that term appears alongside other expressions belonging to the same system. Eco explains that this is an ideal class of texts, whose presence can be predicted by the semantic theory for the given expression. The *ideal text* is widely understood as every conceivable type of text; the word "text" here means the universal supply of cultural meanings, i.e. *sociolects* (cf. Doležel, 1998). From the educational point of view context is a summary of explicit and implicit knowledge, or literacy, which the subject must have to succeed in cultural and social situations. Knowledge of the context leads to third-person ontology: it enables one to become an outside observer and to formalise one's experience through a specialised language and its rules.

When interpreting it can refer to a *class of expressions* (artistic, dramatic, literary) used as an interpretative context. Expressions are interpreted with relation to other expressions within the class (of the same type); their characteristics and semantic relations are examined. The value of the interpretation depends on to what extent the interpreter is familiar with the appropriate context.

Co-text, is according to U. Eco (1994) the real environment of expression during the actual process of communication. Co-text can therefore be directly observed in the interpretation situation. Co-text is linked to

first-person ontology: it is a necessary condition for the immediate experience of the "here and now" in the current time and space.

Eco's concept of context and co-text allows expressivity to be understood as a dynamic phenomenon that has a psychological (subjective), social and cultural component. Expressivity as a psycho-socio-cultural phenomenon includes both *specific expressive phenomena* (class of artifacts with the history of their formation and duration), *ideal content* (concepts, theories, knowledge, ideas, rules, scripts) used in communication and grounded in human cultural memory.

Given that the ontological nature of expression requires immediate participation in the expressive situation, *expression strengthens autonomy in education*. On the other hand, expression in education is subject to interpretation, which reveals the hidden rules and the system itself depends on the universally shared ideal content, rules and standards. In this regard, through expression shows the opposite, *heteronomous* aspect of the paradox of education.

1.4 Expression as a Symbolisation – the Basis for Experimentation with the Paradox of Education

The above interpretation presented expression in education as a recursive movement between autonomous and heteronomous poles. At the root of this oscillation between autonomy and heteronomy is the aforementioned fact that expression is one of the ways of symbolisation. Goodman (1976) explains expression as one of several basic types of reference and symbolisation. This means that expression is understood as a symbolic phenomenon, to which meanings may be attributed. Attribution of meaning takes place in three main ways of reference that are complementary and can be applied all at once or individually. Goodman (1976) calls them *denotation, exemplification,* and *expression*.

Denotation means reference in direction of identifying the denoted phenomenon. For example the "grey" phase denotes all objects that are grey. *Exemplification* is the demonstration of certain features: an object shows properties that convey its meaning. For example, a picture painted mostly in grey colours exemplifies greyness and itself is denoted with the predicate "grey".

Expression is a special kind of exemplification – presentation of contents not literally, but metaphorically. Each expression exemplifies, but cannot be reduced to exemplification. For example, a picture painted in grey literally exemplifies greyness, but metaphorically expresses sadness (Goodman, 1976).

Expression therefore consists of a metaphor demonstrated through "like" (as a make-believe). It is exemplification in two stages: demonstrates an external property Y as the internal state of X. The word "like" represents here the metaphoric transfer and comparison of the meanings of X and Y between different areas of experience or different contexts. During expression the student must form an idea of the relationship that formed the X and Y to the newly organised content structure (cf. Currie & Ravenscroft, 2002, p. 47 n.). It is essential that the idea of a certain form of expressive design can be remembered and repeatedly recalled. In this way specific content comes under increased conscious scrutiny, because its expression can be constructed deliberately and repeatedly, it may be reflected in the social context and can be cultivated when comparing different variants of expression. In this way autonomous expression enters into heteronomous context of society and culture.

The actor, who simulates grief on the stage, is not literally sad, but displays sadness expressively – the "real metaphor" of mourning (cf. Summers, 1991, p. 249 n.). "Expression is not a causal consequence of an experienced situation, but its figurative presentation" (Goodman & Elgin, 1988, p. 43). For example, bitter tears as an expression of real sadness is not in Goodman's sense its expressive expression, because it is only a causal result of a given state of mind. If the expression was only causally conditioned, the actor would have no other usable alternative for their performance – they could not try different variations of expression and compare their quality.

While evocation is involuntary, its elevation to expression assumes the subject's ability to consciously separate their internal state from outside the image of their form and try their alteration (cf. Kulka, 1989). Therefore, expression is a socio-cultural construct, the result of learning. In the history of culture expression has developed as a special way for people to express and communicate complex content via symbolic processing. Expression allows one to seize the contents of experience as a first-person ontology and express it in a form that is understandable to other people. Therefore, the content of expression can be generalised and interpreted in the third-person ontology.

1.5 Expression as a Means of Enhancing the Cognitive Penetrability of Ideas

In addition to sensory or movement notions (i.e. sensory Gestalts that simulate perception and psychomotor experiences), *propositional concepts* also participate in expression (in the form of a connection of an argument

with a predicate; e.g., it can be imagined that a stone is grey or that grief is grey).

Propositional concepts play an essential role in the oscillation between first-and third-person ontologies, because they determine the so-called *cognitive penetrability* of the imagination. Cognitive penetrability is a measure of psychological dependence on the process of conceptual, logical and rational treatment of its content (Pylyshyn in Currie & Ravenscroft, 2002, p. 89 n.).

For example, smell and visual perception are cognitively impenetrable in the sense that what a person smells or sees depends primarily on the perceived object, not a subjective statement about it or according to what it is wished it would be (Currie & Ravenscroft, 2002, p. 90 n.). In contrast, images can be cognitively penetrable because you can recall them on the basis of conscious intention and following conceptual rational-logic operations (see below).

Cultivating the cognitive penetrability of images is a key process in the use of expression in education. In the course of it subjective imagination is combined with expression with the support of concepts and rational-logical operations: the idea can be recalled *deliberately and repeatedly with support in the concept and treated through expressive creation*. This is also a significant moment for dealing with the paradox of education. In dealing with expression the student is led to the separation of its internal state from its outer appearance. This separation occurs as a process of increasing the cognitive penetrability of ideas. In it, students learn to work with the image as a link between their immediate experience and its comprehensive expression for others. Through cognitively penetrable ideas a psychological distance can be taken, to simulate the contents of experience and ultimately metaphorically present them as an expressive display. Cognitive penetrability is a path to free (volitional) penetrability and therefore a "personification" of ideas into action.

This expression in the educational environment ensures a cultural grasp and development of urgent mental contents (emotional, physical or sensory experiences, attitudes) and relative freedom in regards to their experience. An individual is not bound by real experience of urgent content, but learns to perform their mental contents through "like" as a "make-believe", i.e. by metaphorical shift and integration of meanings. The distance from literal presentation offers the subject a relatively free space for expression of emotionally saturated psychological content.

This is a stimulus for *expressive experimentation*: different alternatives of expression can be tested and their quality can be assessed from different perspectives. At the same time, during expressive experimentation the individual tests and manages the paradox of education, because the relationship between expression and its reflection demonstrates different ways of coping with the tension between autonomy and heteronomy, how to respect a certain order, and yet find ways to be yourself (cf. Slavík, 1997, 2001).

2. Subjectivity in Education in Light of the Paradox of Education – A Holistic Model of Subjectivity

As mentioned above, the paradox of education results from the subject's position between autonomy and heteronomy in education. To understand this position so that it can be empirically examined, theoretically interpreted and practically managed with a deeper understanding, we need to rely on the theoretical construct of personality, which explains the subject's movement on the axis of autonomy – heteronomy. This means defining the subject in light of the paradox of education as an active agent in the acquisition of experience, self-formation and world-making in the context of culture. Acquiring subjective experience requires being *in the world* – each person is "*embodied*" and with the body through the senses is "*embedded*" in the world (cf. Cloves, Torrance, & Chrisley, 2007).

"Embodiment" and "embeddedness" in the world is at the core of subjectivity. Self-definition and self-consciousness depend on the Self's grasp of the difference between evocation and expression. As we said, evocation is involuntary and its elevation to expression assumes that the subject is able to consciously separate their internal state from the image of its external appearance. This separation is related to the ability of imagination and mental simulation of the make-believe; simulation gives meaning to the sensory and experiential similarity between different expressions of the same content (cf. Currie & Ravenscroft, 2002; Hurley, 2004, etc.).

If a person knows in his/her mind how to recall and expressively simulate his/her states, he/she can also discover his/her own content in others, and vice versa understand expressions of others as his/her own content. A common meaning is thus ascribed to them and on this basis the state and intentions of others and about oneself are also deduced. The separations of evocation corresponds to the imaginative disposition to play (the make-believe modality, *pretend modus*) with different forms of the same content-concept and ultimately in this way to experiment with one's own expression, i.e. to expressively create (cf. Fonagy & Target, 1996 a, 1996 b).

The foregoing propositions lead to two theses of *holistic models of subjectivity*. The model defines subjectivity with regard to the paradox of education. Subjectivity can be seen as "culturally formulated" and "physically based":

1) a human subject is recognisable and intelligible only through interpretation of its manifestations in the cultural context of expressivity – and so it is the result of interpretation of meanings,
2) a human subject is "embodied" and "embedded in the world", and therefore it constitutes its meanings through experimentation with the designing of expressions formed through the body.

Thesis (1) indicates that the identity and uniqueness of each person can be identified and assessed on the basis of observation and comparison of characteristics – attributes. Each person is himself/herself only by being "in a certain way", i.e. that he has recognisable attributes that manifest themselves in a way that are characteristic only of him. These properties are of course understandable and communicable only because they have names and are general, and therefore are common to more people. They are in their time generally understood as specified or permitted by the contemporary cultural context of expressivity. Each culture has slightly different rules for the appropriate quality and level of expression of various mental contents, and also cultivates them in their special way through education.

Only when one knows how a human characteristic manifests itself in the culture and how it is understood in its time can one recognise and appreciate the unique expression of the characteristic in others and in oneself. Therefore subjectivity, individuality and personal uniqueness are the results of an interpretation of meaning – a *semantic construct*. In practice, it is evident that the individual is able to create penetrable, conceptually grasped images of himself, i.e. to withdraw from direct experience and see himself from the position of third-person ontology.

Thesis (2) supplements thesis (1) on the physical aspects – physicality and its manifestations. Although the individuality of each human being depends on interpretation and semantic constructs, it is representative of real physical beings, i.e. beings experiencing, suffering, rejoicing in the physical world of their actual presence. Therefore, it is characterised as *embodied and embedded in the world,* i.e. as a being existing in real time and space (cf. Cloves et al., 2007). Being here and now through your body is associated with a first-person ontology. Only thus can the individual himself be a source of will to act and an active factor in shaping their own subjectivity.

Self-development is the result and manifestation of the *pursuit of changes* in one's own behaviour. Thus it is manifested in changes in the configuration of expression – a subject actively tries different variations of expressive conduct, and evaluates their consequences and according to them their expressive presentation continues to change. This is called *experimentation with designing expression*. This experimentation is common to all disciplines that seek to find a harmony between the physical and mental dimensions of the body, between its autonomy and its dependence on heteronomous systems of society and culture.

2.1 The Paradox of Education in Voice Education: An Example

A peculiar consequence of the paradox of education is the distribution of approaches to education into two groups, which are mutually contradictory, but dialectically interconnected in a way that is expressed exactly by the term *paradox of education*. They are two sides of the same coin: on the one hand, there are approaches that highlight the individuality of the student; on the other hand, there are approaches that build on the concept of transmission. Keeping the contradictions and tensions between them galvanises the development of expressive disciplines, provided that an organic connection is maintained between the student's own expressive creation and learning of social and cultural context, which gives it an educational purpose (see Boughton, 2004, p. 589).

Vocal training is a good illustration of this trend. The emphasis on individualisation has led to the definition of a specific approach called *psychosomatic voice education*. This name corresponds to the fact that the individuality of each human body is formed in its physicality and the uniqueness of their psyche. From a culturological perspective the human voice is subjected to a "bottom-up" analysis, i.e. from the point of view of its owner. Therefore, we call the psychosomatic approach *individualisation*, while its alternatives can be called *enculturation*. The enculturation concept is programmatically based on the acceptance of cultural patterns or practices of interpretation. In individualisation concepts, when experimenting with voice the subject is led to discover their personal abilities and limits in the sound of their voice alone as well as their creative expression. But creative expression must remain true to the main goal – *physiological* voice activation.

2.2 Personality Development in Psychosomatic Voice Education

The approach to voice education that highlights the interconnectedness of voice expression with the psyche of

the individual develops from the first half of the 20th century (Martienssen-Lohmann, 1923; Husler & Rodd-Marling, 1976; Válková & Vyskočilová, 2007, etc.). Psychosomatically conceived voice education in expression emphasises first-person perspective and focuses on the interconnectedness of the physical and mental components of personality. At the same time the physiological basis of voice creation is maintained, which should not be built over the individual perspective, but should support it. This requires a distinction between the major functional components of voice expression: breath – phonation – articulation – psychosomatics (Válková & Vyskočilová, 2007).

Voice psychosomatic work leads to conscious activation of physiological capabilities (breath – phonation – articulation) and integration with the use of personal growth (psychosomatics). It is implemented through specific voice tasks (methodologies) in the work itself – in the vocal expression and its consequences (or subsequently with a time interval). The process includes *reflection* to ensure the formation of auto-regulation and metacognition during expressive creation. Reflection is a key element in the dynamic linking of subjective experience with the social and cultural context of expression (cf. Slavík, 1997, 2001). Therefore, it is important to differentiate its various forms.

1) The activity itself interferes with the "*examining reflection*" which anticipates the act of voice production, because it is an effort at performance. It depends on awareness accompanied by volitional effort. "Examining reflection" is one of the manifestations of the paradox of education, because it is managed by the will, but it should also be authentic and, therefore, sufficiently spontaneous. Thus, it should not be hampered by excessive effort of the reflective Self, whose "rules" restrict the freedom of the reflected act (of the experiencer).

2) During activities and afterwards the student *reflects heard sounds*. He reflects what is returned and mirrored in space. In this reflection it is important that the student has experienced and realised what it means to hear the "outside", which is different from the perception of shape from the inside. For this reason, students refine this kind of reflection by being led to sensitivity and the skill of so-called *functional hearing*, so that the captured sound does not mislead them.

3) To the experiences of the lesson the student returns again in written form in which they step back from the activity on the one hand and acquires knowledge on the other. *Written self-reflection* is completely free in terms of content, scope and genre. Students are expected to gradually find the best means of reflectively capturing their experiences.

4) *Conversation* at the end of the course allows the dialogue to uncover additional links between the experiences and oneself.

5) *Video recording* allows students to step back from themselves, including awareness of how to treat the space not only in terms of sound but also physically.

The connection of expression with reflection is a functional core for the use of expressive speech in personal development in all expressive disciplines. This is because the expression of personality is the "entry into revelation" and in reflection this revelation can be seen and utilised as an impulse for personal changes. The intersection between the discovery of new voice creation abilities and the ability to hear them and understand them is a prerequisite for students for the first considerations associated with the self.

Specific experience with another, yet unknown expressive speech leads to the reflection that they are linked to the question "Who am I? And how do I want to express myself?" On the basis of reflection in the form of consideration of one's own voice and about oneself, and under the influence of new voice experiences, this leads to the development of new ideas about oneself. We are talking about the so-called *internalising of voice qualities* that are *part of personal qualities*. "The development of human individuality is based on voice activities whose psycho-physical consequences shape the co-creation of personality, which applies also in feedback" (Válková & Vyskočilová, 2007, p. 25).

This approach is consistent with a comprehensive and holistic approach to the curriculum and corresponds to the general systems theory: "…systems theory holds that all levels of organisation are linked to each other in a hierarchical relationship so that change in one affects change in the others …" (Engel, 1977, p. 176).

Psychosomatic approach in voice education through expression and its reflection respects the interconnectedness of different levels of the system and different factors. This approach will be illustrated in the next section. In it we focus on the three main levels of the system – physiological, psychological, social (socio-cultural) and their interconnectedness. In what way is voice change reflected in the psychological and social levels of the individual's system? However, in the spirit of psychosomatic thinking we also inquire in the second direction. How do the psychological and social levels of the individual's system affect their physiological level – voice

creation activation? Dynamic linking of various system components and levels is characteristic of expressive creation and in education requires a comprehensive curriculum and comprehensive research methodology.

3. Method

3.1 Interventions

The presented findings were obtained during the course Voice and Speech Education as a Psychosomatic Discipline. It is a systematic semester-long preparation course with the aim of developing voice skills and the ability to obtain full voice condition, functionally and comprehensively involve the vocal apparatus. This objective is realised in seminars, in the practical and active study of voice and speech. The course focuses on the problems of individual students, part of which is shown in the case study.

3.2 Participant (Subject) Characteristics

A case study is selected from the group of students (1 male, 9 female) – future teachers who have completed the course Voice and Speech Education as a Psychosomatic Discipline in the winter semester 2011/2012 (14 weeks, 2 lessons per week). A student, Mary, continued the course in the following semester (summer semester 2011/2012), in which she had two individual lessons (total of 5 lesson hours).

3.3 Data Collection

Video recordings of classes, written self-reflections, unstructured interviews.

3.4 Data Analysis

We start from case-oriented analysis (Miles & Hubermann, 1994). We chose the case-oriented method of analysis because we consider a case as a specific stage of expressive development of the creative subject. Another reason is that our focus is not on the result, but the process of expressive creation.

3.5 Case Study

Mary (age 22) is a student at the faculty of education. She has experience singing in public, playing the organ and the piano. In the course Mary's problem of "inconsistent register" was discussed (Note 1). Mary: *"... I could never sing with the same voice anything that went above h'. From elementary school that plagued me, for two years singing at the primary school, nothing much has changed, from the chest, I stopped singing altogether ... I know because I have a block, because I hated to sing in public. Even now I don't like it very much – a future music teacher, it sounds funny, right? ... "* (12/12/2011, written self-reflection).

This problem combines the autonomous and heteronomous sides of the paradox of education: the student's inconsistent register limits the attainment of generally recognised heteronomous qualities, but it also seems to inhibit the development of expressive autonomy. Therefore, the teacher worked with the student on "unifying registers". In addition, Mary was led to connect the head and chest resonance, in order to find her own voice and develop sensitivity to changes in voice recognition.

On the path to expressive autonomy Mary faces her fear of self-assertion. This was demonstrated especially during "ty-ži" (Note 2) exercises, which examines self-assertion abilities. Mary responded in self-reflection as follows: *"Military marching, 'ty-ži' – a very powerful experience – I could not finish – I was afraid of my evil tone of voice; if I went on I would have had to wet myself or cry"* (7/11/2011, written self-reflection).

Fear of self-assertion is exacerbated in the paradox of education because the student is unable to identify with the dominant role in which the "evil tone of voice" would put her. This discrepancy is even more clearly shown in situations where a new voice quality was developed – a "pretty voice" – and Mary heard her voice change in the reflection of her video recording. This gave her the opportunity to inspect her expression from the ontological position of a third person. Mary was surprisingly dissatisfied with her "pretty voice" – she assessed it as heteronomous, i.e. not acceptable for herself. She explained it as follows:

"As I said, I find this tone of voice manipulative, it helps exude a certain charisma from people, it's a kind of human tone of voice, which nobody can fool in an argument; it's a voice, as if you had to talk to someone from the higher realms, and something attracts you to him and you are happy to oblige him.
It's in my subconscious, but I think this could be the reason why I chose it only for testing or in a different environment, where I have to solve something verbally – I chose it because I need people who don't judge me on the basis of my high and childlike naive voice and try to understand and accommodate me. Sometimes I do not need to use it and I don't want to use it. I don't want someone to respect me, for me to be so visible; along with the voice it also entails a change in body posture ... and I don't want to look nicer and don't want to be in plain sight" (Mary, 29/4/2012, written self-reflection).

In the quoted passage Mary begins to think about the relationship between her expression and her personal identity. She assesses the variants of her expression, puts it into context with the development of her personality and tries to find a harmony between her presentation and concept of herself. In terms of our holistic model of personality (theses 1 and 2) it is a process of self-interpretation and self-creation of meaning through experimentation with self-expression. This process is further exacerbated by the polarity of the paradox of education and leads Mary to this question: "*Who am I and how do I want to present myself?*"

(Mary 29/4/2012, written self-reflection): "*When I read it now and think about it I think I know why I do not want it ... it's childish, I don't have to be irreparably grown up and know exactly what to do. ... What I noticed right away and what bothered me most and did not stop bothering me, was not so much the voice as the total disharmony of voice and body. I think it's because I don't know, as you asked, who Mary exactly is. ... I think that it will take me time to have a* [tone of voice] *that is 'prettier, more manipulative, etc.', but with a different approach and maybe even slightly changed."*

Mary discovered her other form of voice, her "pretty voice" as she calls it. This "pretty voice" could belong to its autonomous expression, because she does not reject it *a priori* as something that does not belong to her. She only does not want to use it, because she attributes a manipulative influence to it. It can be assumed that the "pretty voice" is, among other things, an expression of her adulthood. But Mary still does not accept entering adulthood (with its specific scripts), because adulthood is associated with the voices of "charismatic, respected, manipulative" people, which she does not want to be. The realm of adulthood is associated in her mind with heteronomy, but she realises that she should enter into it autonomously, without fearing a loss of identity.

4. Results

The case findings illustrate the process in which reflection completes the learning begun in expression. Expression has content that can be semantically interpreted in reflection. When a student in voice education seminar focuses on the sound of the voice, two sides of the formation of meaning are observed:

1) *confirmation of known structure*, i.e. that which is common among various sound structures and what constitutes a pre-known importance in the expression of the revelation is not surprising;
2) unique *overlap* of current structure of expression beyond existing structures – a prerequisite for the discovery of new, previously unsuspected importance.

In practice, this pattern manifests itself in "awareness": the student realises, or recognises, a certain sound quality as something previously heard, previously known. And they realise that in the current situation this "former recognition" is expressed somewhat differently, in a new way. By comparing a current expressive presentation with memories of its past equivalents, expressive structures are developed, along with the ability to recognise and classify the expressive structure. The listener then easily discovers unexpected innovations and can experiment with them.

Experimentation is based on a comparison of different design variations of expression either with each other or with their accompanying experience. In this way the relatively best alternative to one's own voice expression can be found. In the case study the *recursive* interconnection of the physiological with the psychological and socio-cultural levels of the system is apparent. It is possible to change one of them, but always with the awareness that for personal growth and development it is necessary for the change to be made at all three levels of the system. The body in this way creates a semantic construct woven from the fabric and notions embedded in auto-socio-stylistic schemes. These are the expression constructs in which it is possible to intervene and alter the same way as other expressive works. Therefore, re-construction of expression may be a way of re-constructing the subject in the context of cultural rules of communication and content sharing between people.

5. Conclusion

In this work, we distinguish two mutually connected counterparts of educational culture in the context of the paradox of education: enculturation and individualisation.

i. The focus of attention can be primarily just the quality of expression itself measured in terms of cultural patterns or norms. This approach is characteristic of *enculturation* education.
ii. The *individualisation, psychosomatic* concept of education by contrast aims to improve the holistic quality – it works with the development of expression as part of personality structure. This means treating the quality of expression is not only a goal, but also a resource for reflection, self-knowledge and appreciation – for personal development. The creator is at the centre of attention in expressive development.

Expressive education, as its name suggests, aims through teaching activities to develop expression deliberately,

systematically and methodically. It is nevertheless not possible to exclude comparison of better and worse expression with regard to socially and culturally recognised qualities in a particular context (e.g. voice in the social role of singer, actor, broadcaster, teacher). However this outside view of the quality of expression is not sufficient for education. Expression is not only an "external" dimension of the observable, but is always *re-created* by a unique individual in a unique human situation. It is not only compared with the standard, but also is perceived, interpreted and experienced here and now by the individual himself. In this view, from the position of the Self, the quality of expression is associated with nature, authenticity, sensitivity to creative perspective.

When expressing himself the individual must deal with the paradox of education, because he is led to authenticity and sensitivity towards himself, but that interferes with the external demands and automatism of daily life. As mentioned, the individual develops in the social and cultural context of their daily "life requirements" and can realise themselves within them. The teacher and their students therefore find themselves in a particularly difficult position: they must deal with the difficult personal transition between the personal and the general cultural dimension. Generally speaking, it is possible to move from cultural to personal, or vice versa. In the history of education both ways alternate and intertwine.

6. Discussion

The preceding text is built on Goodman's (1976) analytical conception of expression. With regard to the educational context the analytical point of view is supplemented with reflections on the subject as the actor of experiences and feelings. This approach is based on the phenomenological assumption that language can mediate and sustain experience among people but it cannot originate it around. This approach puts creative expression on the sensitive border between the authentic being of the subject and the combinatorics of transpersonal codes of culture. Thanks to this position expression in education has become an experimental field for the investigation and treatment of the paradox of education understood as part of the general principle of relations between the subject and their social and cultural context. This approach leads into a holistic model of subjectivity and indirectly supports those efforts that lead to a holistic approach to assessment in the expressive disciplines with emphasis on the educational process, not only on the evaluation of outcomes. The *paradox of education* construct therefore emphasises maintaining a reasonable balance of autonomy and heteronomy and contributes to a critique of one-sidedness in education.

Acknowledgements

The creation of this text was supported by a grant from the Czech Republic *Teaching profession in the environment of changing education requirements MSM 0021620862.*

References

Arthur, J., & Davison, J. (2002). Experiential Learning, Social Literacy and the Curriculum. In D. Scott, & H. Lawson (Eds.), *Citizenship Education and the Curriculum* (pp. 27-44). New Jersey: Alex.

Boughton, D. (2004). Assessing Art Learning in Changing Contexts: High-Stakes Accountability, International Standards and Changing Conceptions of Artistic Development. In E. W. Eisner, & M. D. Day (Eds.), *Handbook of Research and Policy in Art Education* (pp. 585-607). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Boughton, D., Eisner, E. W., & Ligtvoet, J. (Eds.). (1996). *Evaluating and Assessing the Visual Arts in Education: International Perspectives*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Bourriaud, N. (2002). *Postproduction*. New York: Lucas & Sternberg.

Cloves, R., Torrance, S., & Chrisley, R. (2007). Machine Consciousness. Embodiment and Imagination. *Journal of Consciousness Studies, 14*(7), 7-14.

Craft, A. (1997). Identity and Creativity: Educating for Post-modernism? *Teacher Development: An International Journal of Teachers' Professional Development, 1*(1), 83-96.

Croce, B. (1966). *Philosophy, Poetry, History: An Anthology of Essays*. London: Oxford University Press.

Croce, B. (1997). *The Aesthetic as the Science of Expression and the Linguistic in General*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Currie, G., & Ravenscroft, I. (2002). *Recreative Minds*. *Imagination in Philosophy and Psychology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198238089.001.0001

Doležel, L. (1998). *Heterocosmica. Fiction and Possible Worlds.* Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Dorn, C., Madeja, S., & Sabol, R. (2001). *Evaluating Expressive Learning: Final Report.* A Project Supported by the National Endowment for the Arts.

Eco, U. (1994). *The Limits of Interpretation.* Bloomington-Indianopolis: Indiana University Press.

Engel, G. L. (1977). The Need for a New Medical Model: A Challenge for Biomedicine. *Science, 196*(4286), 129-136. http://dx.doi.org/10.1126/science.847460

Fonagy, P., & Target, M. (1996 a). Playing with Reality: I. Theory of the Mind and the Normal Development of Psychic Reality. *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis, 77*, 217-233.

Fonagy, P., & Target, M. (1996 b). Playing with Reality: II. The Development of Psychic Reality from a Theoretical Perspective. *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis, 77*, 459-479.

Goodman, N. (1976). *Languages of Art. An Approach to a Theory of Symbols*. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, Inc.

Goodman, N. (1984). *Of Mind and Other Matters*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Goodman, N., & Elgin, C. Z. (1988). *Reconceptions in Philosophy and other Arts and Sciences.* London: Routledge.

Hurley, S. (2004). The Shared Circuits Hypothesis: A Unified Functional Architecture for Control, Imitation, and Simulation. In S. Hurley, & N. Chater (Eds.), *Perspectives on Imitation: From Neuroscience to Social Science*, *1.* Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Husler, F., & Rodd-Marling, Y. (1976). *Singing – The Physical Nature of the Vocal Organ. A Guide to the Unlocking of the Singing Voice*. London: Hutchinson.

Kaščák, O. (2002). Je pedagogika připravená na změny perspektiv? Rekontextualizace pod vlivem radikálního individuálního konstruktivismu a postmoderního sociálního konstruktivismu (Is Pedagogy Ready for the Change of Perspective? Reconceptualising Under the Influence of Radical Individual Constructivism and Postmodern Social Constructivism). *Pedagogika/Pedagogy, 52*(4), 388-414.

Kemp, G. (2009). Croce's aesthetics. In E. N. Zalta (ed.), *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Stanford University. Retrieved from http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2009/entries/croce-aesthetics/

Kulka, T. (1989). Art and Science: An outline of a Popperian Aesthetics. *British Journal of Aesthetic*, *29*(3), 122-148. http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/bjaesthetics/29.3.197

Lipovetsky, G. (1993). L'ère du vide. Essais sur l'individualisme contemporain. Paris: Gallimard.

Lohmann, P. (1968). *Chyby hlasové techniky a jejich náprava (Vocal Error - Vocal Advice)*. Praha-Bratislava: Supraphon.

Martienssen-Lohmann, F. (1923). *Das Bewusste Singen*. Leipzig: C. F. Kahnt Verlag.

Miles, M. B., & Hubermann, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative Data Analysis. A Sourcebook of New Methods*. London: Sage.

Recommendation of the European Parliament. (2006). *Official Journal of the European Union*. L 394/10 (EN), 30.12.2006.

Ricoeur, P. (1967). The Image of God and the Epic of Man. In Ricoeur, P. *History and Truth*. Evanston Illinois: Northwestern University Press. (*Histoire et Vérité*. 3rd edn. Paris : Editions du Seuil.)

Russell, B. (1910-1911). Knowledge by Acquaintance and Knowledge by Description. *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society (New Series), 11*, 108-128.

Searle, J. A. (2004). *Mind*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Slavík, J. (1997). *Od výrazu k dialogu ve výchově – Artefiletika (From Expression to Dialogue in Education – Artefiletics)*. Praha: Univerzita Karlova – Karolinum.

Slavík, J. (2001). La practique réflexive dans la formation des enseignants d'arts plastiques: phénomène pédagogique dans un contexte politique (expérience tchèque). *Recherche et Formation: pour les professions de l'éducation, 10*(36), 113-130.

Summers, D. (1991). Real Metaphor: Towards a Redefinition of the 'Conceptual' Image. In N. Bryson, M. A. Holly, & K. Moxey (Eds.), *Visual Theory: Painting and Interpretation* (pp. 231-259). New York: Harper Collins.

Válková, L., & Vyskočilová, E. (2007). *Hlas individuality, psychosomatické pojetí hlasové výchovy (The Voice of Individuality, The Concept of Psychosomatic Voice Education)*. Praha: AMU v Praze.

Notes

Note 1. Isolating a single register "means solidifying the glottal function, so this in itself is somehow subject to spasms and other registers directly repel each other" (Lohmann, 1968).

Note 2. The exercise that the student calls "ty-ži" is a technique by B. Mikulič. An individual has to walk around the class as if he/she was a soldier who knows where he/she wants to go. His/her steps are strong and sure; voice resonates with every step made by the body and reflects the conviction: "I know what I want and I go for it."